

SECRET

1 September 1971

MEMORANDUM FOR: Deputy Director for Plans

SUBJECT : Long Term Retention of Certain Office of Finance Records

REFERENCE : Memorandum to DDP from DDS, dated 25 August 1971, Subject: As Above (Tab A)

1. Forwarded herewith (Tab B) is a proposed positive response to Reference, by which you would agree to the proposition that certain finance records would be destroyed at the end of the legally required 12-year retention period.

2. I unreservedly recommend this resolution of the problem, though its effect is to overrule the CI Staff. Since 1968 that unit has pressed for a 30-year retention of these records, for reasons set forth in Tab C. That rationale, we feel, was unsupportable when written and all the more so in today's climate. If we are truly to limit our activities, under budget and personnel constraints, to the most basic missions of the Service, then the luxuries of saving excessive records for excessive periods for marginal and hypothetical purposes must be foregone. Indeed this would now be true even were funds and personnel unconstrained, for our data handling techniques will not usefully permit the inclusion of mass data not closely related to our main missions in a real sense.

3. I would not presume to suggest that our CI mission is not basic; it surely is. Nor would I feel so strongly about the instant case were it unique. In fact it typifies a number of individual problems (listed in Tab D) wherein universally there is a clear disagreement between, on the one hand, the CI Staff which argues for retention and, on the other hand, substantive offices and the Information Services Division arguing to the contrary. We would propose to put these matters to you and the ADDP routinely as they surface. We would not expect

SECRET

GROUP 1
Excluded from automatic
downgrading and
declassification

SECRET

-2-

uniform decisions contrary to the CI view. But we would also not expect unvarying acceptance of that view, which has been the case in the past.

4. I have not in the instant case reworked this matter with CI Staff. Should you wish me to do so, I would expect little more than an elaboration of the Tab C rationale. The burden of that statement is, I believe, unacceptable. Scare hypotheses based on the infamous Philby case do not, I submit, constitute a valid argument for the CI proposal. Moreover, use of materials is a valid criterion for deciding such matters, although, of course not solely determinative.

5. Pressed as we are for sheer physical space, and required as we are to trim our operations to essentials, avoid peripheral uses of personnel and funds, and maximize the efficient use of our expensive information machinery, I cannot see acceptance of CI's position in this matter at this time, and therefore recommend your decision contrary thereto. As comparable cases arise, we will attempt to offset the aporriphobic approach to information retention by reasoned arguments based on our missions and capabilities.

/s/

Chief, Information Services Division

25X1A

Attachments, A/S

cc: ADDP

Distribution:

- Orig. & 1 - Addressee w/attachs
- 1 - ADDP w/attachs
- 1 - DIM w/attachs A, C, & D only✓
- 1 - C/IS file w/attachs

SECRET